

WARFARE AND THE ARMY AT EMAR

Juan-Pablo Vita (CSIC-Madrid)

1. Introduction

The State of Emar does not seem to have represented a political and military power at any time during its history¹. The Emar of the Middle Bronze Age was mostly an important commercial emporium², thanks to the strategic geographical location of the site, in the centre of the main commercial routes over land and by river that linked Assyria with the North of Mesopotamia. From the political standpoint, it was the most advanced post of the Kingdom of Aleppo against the Kingdom of Mari. This borderline position, at the converging point of two great Kingdoms, made it unavoidable for Emar to be involved in military episodes, of which there seem to be indirect indications³.

1.2. Later on, in the Late Bronze Age, the geographical location of the city led to Emar again being at the contact point between powerful Kingdoms. This period in the history of Emar is illustrated directly by archives that were made and found in the city itself. The purpose of this article is to gather and assess the elements that are contained in those files regarding warfare and the army. As is to be expected, the information that they provide regarding this issue mainly concerns the Kingdom of Emar under Hittite control. In this period Emar was not prominent from the military standpoint, but texts show that the city did possess an army, no doubt controlled by and partly composed of Hittite troops, and they contain elements of historical interest in the matter.

¹ I am very grateful to Dr W. G. E. Watson, Newcastle upon Tyne, for checking the English of this article. The following abbreviations will be used: ASJ 10 = A. Tsukimoto, *Sieben spätbronzezeitliche Urkunden aus Syrien*, ASJ 10 (1988) pp. 153-189; ASJ 12 = A. Tsukimoto, *Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (I)*, ASJ 12 (1990) pp. 177-259; ASJ 13 = A. Tsukimoto, *Akkadian Tablets in the Hirayama Collection (II)*, ASJ 13 (1991) pp. 275-333; Emar VI = D. Arnaud, *Recherches au Pays d'Aštata. Emar VI.3*, Paris 1986; ET = J. G. Westenholz, *The Emar Tablets*, Groningen 2000; Iraq 54 = S. Dalley - B. Teissier, *Tablets from the Vicinity of Emar and Elsewhere*, Iraq 54 (1992) pp. 83-111; RE = G. Beckman, *Texts from the Vicinity of Emar in the Collection of Jonathan Rosen*, Padova 1996; Sigrist = M. Sigrist, *Seven Emar Tablets*, in A. F. Rainey (ed.), *Kinattūtu ša dārāti. Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*, Tel Aviv 1993, pp. 165-184; SMEA 30 = D. Arnaud, *Tablettes de genres divers du moyen-Euphrate*, SMEA 30 (1992) pp. 195-245; TBR = D. Arnaud, *Textes syriens de l'âge du Bronze Récent*, Barcelona 1991.

² On Emar in the Middle Bronze Age, see J.-M. Durand, *La cité-état d'Imâr à l'époque des rois of Mari*, *MARI* 6 (1990) pp. 39-92.

³ As indicated by J.-M. Durand, *La cité-état d'Imâr*, who discusses the possible occupation of Emar by Mari (p. 62); it is feasible that the ships of Emar later past in the service of Aleppo, in war actions in the Euphrates (p. 71). It may also be assumed that the city of Emar possessed a strong defensive position (p. 65).

2. Emar as a military outpost of the Hittite empire

2.1. Emar, capital city of the country of Aštata, passed from belonging to the Mitanni Kingdom to being integrated in the Ḫatti Empire by means of the treaty established between the Kings Šuppiluliuma I and Šattiwaza (KBo I 1), in the second half of the 14th century B.C.⁴. This was followed by other more specific treaties between Karkemiš and Emar⁵. Emar thus became the easternmost military outpost of the Hittite Empire in Assyria, facing Babylonia and, especially, Assyria. According to the political and administration reorganization carried out by Ḫatti in Syria, the kings of Karkemiš, as Viceroys of the Emperor in the region, gained direct jurisdiction over Emar.

2.2. However, Hittite politics in Syria enabled Emar to have its own political identity. Unlike the Ebla period, Emar does not seem to have had any kings in the era of the Mari archives⁶. However, under Hittite control, Emar recovered the institution of the monarchy by means of a local dynasty⁷. Local institutions supervised by Hittite officials governed the kingdom until its end, at the beginning of the 12th century B.C.⁸

2.3. Emar thus became a military outpost of the Hittite empire against the growing power of the Assyrians. The new strategic role that Emar was given radically affected its urban history: The excavations led by J. Margueron at Meskene/Emar (1972-1976)

⁴ Against the most widespread interpretation, that proposed to restore references to the country of Aštata in the lacunae of lines 16' and 17' of KBo I 1, J. D. Hawkins, *The Hittite Name of Til Barsip: Evidence from a New Hieroglyphic Fragment from Tell Ahmar*, *AnSt* 33 (1983) pp. 135-136, suggested restoring references to Karkemiš. The text has been studied from the perspective proposed by Hawkins by M. Yamada, *The Northern Border of the Land of Aštata*, *ASJ* 16 (1994) pp. 261-268. See, similarly, H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, HdO 34, Leiden 1999, p. 165, n. 113. On the geographical matters regarding the treaty also see M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops at the Siege of Emar?*, in M. W. Chavalas (ed.), *Emar: the History, Religion and Culture of a Syrian Town in the Late Bronze Age*, Bethesda 1996, p. 37.

⁵ As Emar VI 18 seems to demonstrate (cf. ll. 11-12 and 25). On this document, the possibility that the treaty it mentions was made between Karkemiš and Emar, and that it was favoured by the King Ini-Tešup of Karkemiš, see L. D'Alfonso, *Tarḫuntašša in einem Text aus Emar*, *AoF* 26 (1999) pp. 314-321; *id.*, *Syro-Hittite Administration at Emar: New Considerations on the Basis of a Prosopographic Study*, *AoF* 27 (2000) pp. 280, 289-295.

⁶ J.-M. Durand, *La cité-état d'Imâr*, p. 55.

⁷ Our current knowledge regarding the Emar dynasty have been summarized in G. Beckman, RE p. XII. Recently, A. Skaist, *The Chronology of the Legal Texts from Emar*, *ZA* 88 (1998) pp. 45-71, has collected arguments supporting the existence of a second dynasty in Emar. Šuppiluliuma I, at the moment of the conquest of Emar, would have replaced one dynasty with another, cf. p. 64 (on p. 58 he proposes some changes in Beckman's table). The nature of the Emar monarchy has been studied by D. E. Fleming, *A Limited Kingship: Late Bronze Emar in Ancient Syria*, *UF* 24 (1992) pp. 59-71. As for the end of Emar, see also H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, p. 318 n. 35.

⁸ G. M. Beckman, *Hittite Administration in Syria in the Light of the Texts from Ḫattuša, Ugarit and Emar*, in M. W. Chavalas - J.-L. Hayes (eds.), *New Horizons in the Study of Ancient Syria*, Malibu 1992, pp. 41-49; *id.*, *Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: the View from Masat and Emar*, in O. Carruba - M. Giorgieri - C. Mora (eds.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia

have revealed that, while Šuppiluliuma I or his son Muršili II were governing, Emar was refounded by Ḫatti in a new location towards the end of the 14th century B.C. A location with good natural defences was chosen, reinforced by new building work and fortifications, which allowed the continuity of commercial activities⁹. The city and regional defence system was completed by the construction of fortresses such as Tell Faq'us, approximately 10 km southeast of Emar¹⁰. The attacks that the city suffered later (§3) justified the defensive precautions adopted by the Hittites.

3. Emar and warfare

3.1. The new strategic role assigned to Emar, now located in front of the area of Assyrian influence, was to involve the city in new episodes of war and siege. The measures of defence adopted by the Hittites (§2.3) proved to be efficient in the long run. As happened with other institutions (§2.2), Emar no doubt had its own army at its disposal, controlled by Hittite contingents, that would actively participate in all the offensive and defensive actions that might affect the city and the territory it controlled.

3.2. The archives of Emar contain explicit information regarding the wars that the city underwent. A significant piece of information concerning the latter is contained in some formulae that, with differences, cover several types of testaments and contracts and allude to difficult living conditions, famine and hostility. C. Zaccagnini made a list of 33 occurrences of these formulae¹¹, a list that may be completed by the following references:

- Emar VI 196:2' (fragment of a testament): [*i-na* M]U KALAG.GA x[
- SMEA 30, 9:6 (testament): *i-na* MU^{kám} KALAG.GA
- Iraq 54, 2:33 (testament): MU^{hà} *nu-kur-ti* KALAG.GA
- ET 9:19 (sale of a vineyard): *a-na dan-nu-ti*

1995, pp. 26-32, 34; L. D'Alfonso, Syro-Hittite Administration at Emar, pp. 269-295.

⁹ For the archeological aspects of Emar, see more in detail J.-C. Margueron, Imar et Emar: une recherche qui se prolonge...(histoire d'une problématique), *MARI* 6 (1990) pp. 103-106; *id.*, Meskene (Imar/Emar). B. Archäologisch, *RIA* 8 (1993) pp. 84-93; J.-C. Margueron - M. Sigrist, Emar, in E. Meyers (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, vol. 2, Oxford 1997, pp. 236-239; B. Geyer, Une ville aujourd'hui engloutie: Emar. Contribution géomorphologique à la localisation of la cité, *MARI* 6 (1990) pp. 107-119.

¹⁰ J.-C. Margueron, Aux marches of l'Empire hittite: Une campagne of fouille à tell Faq'ous (Syrie), citadelle du pays d'Aštata, en *La Syrie au Bronze Récent: Recueil publié à l'occasion du cinquantième de la découverte d'Ugarit-Ras Shamra*, Paris 1982, pp. 47-66. See also *id.*, Tall Faq'ūs, *AfO* 28 (1981-1982) pp. 217-219; *id.*, Meskene (Imar/Emar), p. 91; H. Klengel, Die Keilschrifttexte von Meskene und die Geschichte von Aštata/Emar, *OLZ* 83 (1988) cols. 649-650.

¹¹ C. Zaccagnini, War and Famine at Emar, *Or* 64 (1995) pp. 96-98.

As Zaccagnini already suggested¹², it would be useful to determine whether these formulae refer to one or several episodes in the history of Emar. The matter continues to be difficult to resolve. Even if, in general, the formulae allude to a specific year (*i/a-na* MU... “in the year of ...”), they cannot be considered as year formulae¹³. It may be of greater use to consider the tablets belonging to one of the two scribal traditions of Emar. A. Skaist recently reached the conclusion that both traditions of legal texts are to some extent contemporary, but cover as a whole different chronological periods: the documents belonging to the Syrian tradition would cover approximately the period from 1400 to 1220 B.C, those from the Syro-Hittite tradition from 1275 to 1210 B.C.¹⁴ The texts that mention famine and war are almost equally distributed between both traditions: 15 texts in the Syro-Hittite tradition¹⁵, 19 in the Syrian tradition¹⁶. Were it possible to demonstrate that all the texts refer to one and the same war period, this period could be located between 1275 and 1210 B.C. Crucial for discussing that possibility are the following texts.

3.3. In 1985, D. Arnaud published the text Emar VI 42. Discovered at Emar in the Temple of Ba‘al¹⁷, the document contains three dedications of kings of Emar who offer golden cups to the god Ba‘al¹⁸. According to Arnaud’s first interpretation, the second and longest dedication (ll. 8-19) tells how a king of Emar (Bisu-Dagan) freed the city from the tyranny of another Emar king (Pilsu-Dagan), also sovereign of “the men of the country of Kiri”¹⁹.

3.3.1. The text has a complicated reading and interpretation history. After Arnaud’s

¹² C. Zaccagnini, War and Famine, p. 98.

¹³ See S. Dalley - B. Teissier, *Iraq* 54 p. 94; see also C. Zaccagnini, War and Famine, pp. 106-107. Nevertheless, these formulae, which may occur anywhere in the text, may have been of a legal nature, cf. D. Arnaud, TBR p. 15; Dalley - Teissier, *ibid.* (a formula with a similar meaning would be *i-na* MU-ti *ša mu-ta-ni* “in the year of plague”, RE 18:4). Unlike Ugarit, the legal texts from Emar contain examples of genuine dates, usually at the end of the document, indicated by month, by the day and the month, or by the month and the year, see J.-P. Vita, Datation et genres littéraires à Ougarit, in F. Briquel-Chatonnet - H. Lozachmeur (eds.), *Proche-Orient ancien: Temps vécu, temps pensé*, Paris 1998, p. 41. According to S. Seminara, *L'accadico di Emar*, Rome 1998, p. 11, “le formule di datazione...sono esclusive della scuola siriana”.

¹⁴ A. Skaist, The Chronology, pp. 45-71.

¹⁵ Emar VI nos. 83, 86, 121, 208, 216; AuOr Spl. 1 nos. 25, 44, 52, 65, 74; SMEA 30, 9:6; ASJ 10 nos. C, E; ASJ 13, 37; Sigrist 2. The number would grow to 16 if it were possible to include Emar VI 196:2’.

¹⁶ It would be 20 if it were possible to include Emar VI 162. There is not enough information available to attribute AuOr 5, 13 to one tradition or another.

¹⁷ On the location of the discovery and the archival context of the text, see M. Dietrich, Die akkadischen Texte der Archive und Bibliotheken von Emar, *UF* 22 (1990), pp. 33-35. According to Arnaud, *Emar VI.1* p. 7, the text was discovered in the “Temple du dieu of l’orage”.

¹⁸ On the alternative “Adad” instead of “Ba‘al” for ^d10, see F. M. Fales, Notes on the Royal Family, in D. Charpin - F. Joannès (eds.), *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs*, Paris 1991, p. 82 n. 8.

work, the document was discussed by several scholars, notably J.-M. Durand²⁰, C. Zaccagnini²¹, F. M. Fales²², A. Tsukimoto²³, M. Dietrich²⁴ and M. R. Adamthwaite²⁵. These works reveal that the text no doubt merits a new collation. But they have also allowed a correct reading of two passages crucial for the understanding of its contents: In line 9, LUGAL ERIM^{mes} KUR *Hur-ri* must be read (instead of LUGAL ERIM^{mes} KUR *Ki-ri*)²⁶, in line 11, ^m*Pi-su*-^dKUR (instead of ^m*Bi-su*-^dKUR). Apart from some unresolved readings²⁷, the general sense of the text is thus clear: When attacked by a Hurrian king, Pilsu-Dagan, king of Emar, defeated the Hurrian troops and saved the city, with the help of the god Ba'al and the support of the city's troops.

3.3.2. Who was the author of the text? Arnaud tends to consider Ea-mudammiq (Il. 7, 19, 23) as the author of the original text and not the material author of the tablet, who may have copied it from an original text²⁸. Fales, on the other hand, raises some doubts as to whether these dedicated golden cups ever existed and tends to see Ea-mudammiq as the material author of the text we have²⁹. Zaccagnini also doubts whether the cups ever existed, but insofar as Ea-mudammiq is concerned, he believes that "it seems unlikely that this person was the writer of the tablet which rather appears to be a school exercise drawn up by an unexperienced pupil"³⁰. The possibility that the three dedications of Emar VI 42 were no other than a scribal exercise, given its poor spelling and the doubts concerning authorship, could raise the problem of the historical authenticity of the document and, thus, of the Hurrian attack against Emar.

¹⁹ LUGAL ERIM.MEŠ KUR *Ki-ri* (D. Arnaud, Emar VI.3, p. 57).

²⁰ J.-M. Durand, *RA* 83 (1989) pp. 183-184; *id.*, Hautes Personnages à Emâr-«"Roi of Kiri" fantôme» à Emâr?, *NABU* 1989, pp. 34-35.

²¹ C. Zaccagnini, Golden Cups Offered to the Gods at Emar, *Or* 59 (1990), pp. 518-520.

²² F. M. Fales, Notes on the Royal Family, pp. 81-90.

²³ A. Tsukimoto, *ASJ* 12 p. 192.

²⁴ M. Dietrich, *Die akkadischen Texte*, pp. 33-35.

²⁵ M. R. Adamthwaite, Ethnic Movements in the Thirteenth Century B.C. As Discernible From The Emar Texts, in G. Bunnens (ed.), *Cultural Interaction in the Ancient Near East*, Louvain 1996, pp. 98-101 (his work is based on a photograph, cf. p. 100).

²⁶ Just as D. Arnaud himself had already suspected, *Les hittites sur le Moyen-Euphrate: protecteurs et indigènes*, *Hethitica* 8 (1987), p. 21 n. 14, and declares in TBR p. 14.

²⁷ The main difficulties of reading and interpretation are concentrated in lines 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15. Line 10: *i-la-mi-in* (Arnaud), *ú!-la-mi-in* (Zaccagnini); line 11: *IGI-2-šu* (Arnaud), *qa-ti-šu* (Zaccagnini); line 12: *iš-ši-ma* (Arnaud), *i-ši-ma* (Adamthwaite); line 13: *ig-ri-ti MUŠEN GI ša ŠÀ-šu* (Arnaud), *iq-ri ti-iš-gi ša ŠÀ-šu* (Durand), *ik-ri-bi4(BAD) el/il5-qè* (Zaccagnini), *eg-re-ti* (Dietrich; Adamthwaite); line 15: *ša ŠÀ-šu u BÀD-šu TÉŠ.BA il-lík-šu* (Arnaud), *ša ŠÀ-šu BÀD-ma TÉŠ.BA nak-ra-šu* (Durand; Adamthwaite: *nak-ra-šu*), *a+na ba-la(Al)-ti-šu* (Zaccagnini), *a-na ba'-ru-tu-šu* (Tsukimoto), *TÉŠ.BA dab-da-šu* (Dietrich).

²⁸ D. Arnaud, Emar VI.3, p. 58.

²⁹ F. M. Fales, Notes on the Royal Family, p. 84 n. 23.

³⁰ C. Zaccagnini, Golden Cups, p. 518. Also *id.*, Ancora sulle coppe d'oro e d'argento nel Vicino Oriente del Tardo Bronzo, *Scienze dell'Antichità* 5 (1991) p. 375.

But in 1990, Tsukimoto published the legal document HCCT 7³¹, where it is stated (ll. 29-37) that "As the Hurrian troops surrounded the city wall of Emar (*i-nu-ma* ERIM^{meš} *hur-ri BÀD* ^{uru}*e-mar*^{ki} *il-mi*), the divination of Mašruḫe, diviner of the king and the city, came true. Pilsu-Dagan (*Pil-su*^d *Da-gan*), the king, therefore, has given him this field as a present"³². The historical authenticity of the events narrated in Emar VI 42:8-19 was thus confirmed.

3.3.3. Two more documents were later published which also mention the Hurrian siege against Emar:

- TBR 9: a legal text that declares that the purchase of a specific field was carried out (ll. 21-22) "pendant la terrible guerre où le Hourrite assiégea le rempart" (*i-na* KÚR.KÚR KALA-*ti ša!* *Hur-ri BÀD il-mi-ma*) and the first witness (l. 39) is "Pilsu-Dagan, king" (*Pil-su*^d *Da-gan*)³³;

- RE 77: a legal text of purchase of fields. The text is dated in the final lines by the month and the "Year when the King of the Hurrian troops [harmed?] the city of Emar" (ll. 34-35: MU^{kam} LUGAL ERIM^{meš} *Hur-[ri]* ^{uru}*e-mar*^{ki} [*i-la-mi-in*?]). The restorations, suggested by G. Beckman, are fully plausible. This document would be contemporary with the Hurrian siege.

No doubt the four texts (Emar VI 42, HCCT 7, TBR 9, RE 77) refer to a single attack that took place during the reign of the king of Emar, Pilsu-Dagan. The attack would have affected not only the city of Emar but, as would be expected, the entire surrounding region. This seems to be proved by the legal document RE 70, a purchase of a house, dated (ll. 28-29) "When the King of the Hurrian troops conquered the town of Šuma" (*i-nu-ma* LUGAL ERIM^{meš} *Hur-ri /* ^{uru}*Šu-ma*^{ki} *i-pu-uš*)³⁴, a town located near Emar³⁵.

3.3.4. Various authors have tried to date the Hurrian attack accurately, but the proposals diverge on this point. The most recent attempt, by Skaist, bases his proposal on the letter KBo 1, 14 (= CTH 173)³⁶. A Hittite king (probably Hattušili III) complains in the letter that the "men of Turira" carry out raids in Hittite territory and asks the

³¹ A. Tsukimoto, ASJ 13 pp. 189-190.

³² A. Tsukimoto, ASJ 13 p. 191.

³³ As M. R. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements*, p. 102, had already noted.

³⁴ G. Beckman, RE p. 90.

³⁵ J. A. Belmonte, *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der Texte aus Syrien im 2. Jt. v. Chr. (Alalah, El-Amarna, Ugarit und Mitteleuphrat)*, RGTC 12.2 (in press), s.v. *Šūmu: "Stadt in der Nähe von Emar" (personal communication, November 2000). See also G. Beckman, RE p. 91.

³⁶ A. Skaist, *The Chronology*, pp. 64-67.

Assyrian king (most probably Adad-nirari I) to put an end to the attacks³⁷. Skaist suggests that Turira was the capital of Ḫanigalbat, that is, of a Hurrian kingdom under Assyrian control. The Assyrians would be the instigators of the Hurrian attacks against Hittite territory, providing a plausible context for the Hurrian attacks against Emar, which could be dated around 1268-1265 B.C.³⁸ But, in our opinion, these dates would be too high for the reign of Pilsu-Dagan. It seems more plausible that the second-last king of Emar had governed at some point during the second half of the 13th century B.C.

In this same line of reasoning, Tsukimoto proposed a date for the attack between 1244 and 1239/37 B.C., based on the simultaneity of the reigns of Pilsu-Dagan, Ini-Tešup (Karkemiš), Tudḫaliya IV and Šalmanaser I and of a possible "'vacant' situation from the death of Šalmanaser I (1244 B.C.) until the Hurrian war (1239-1237 B.C.) by Tukulti-Ninurta I"³⁹. Astour rejects Tsukimoto's arguments⁴⁰, claiming that "at the time of the siege of Emar, whenever we place it, there was only one 'king of the Hurrian troops', namely, the Assyrian grand vizier and commander-in-chief who, in addition, carried the title of 'king of Ḫanigalbat' and was called at Emar by the familiar Assyrian version of the title"⁴¹. In his opinion, and after dating the beginning of Pilsu-Dagan's reign towards 1235⁴², "the siege of Emar inscribes itself naturally into the context of an Assyrian intrusion into Syria"⁴³, the Tukulti-Ninurta I epoch being the one that provides the episode with its best historical context. In terms of absolute chronology, the assault on Emar could be situated around 1227, year in which the Assyrian king would have occupied the royal throne⁴⁴, taking advantage of the internal problems of Ḫatti⁴⁵. Adamthwaite also considers Pilsu-Dagan as a contemporary of Tukulti-Ninurta I and suggests understanding the Hurrian attacks against Emar as the fruit of an "attenuated nature of Assyrian administration in the western Jezireh", which would give way to the "Hurrian and other semi-nomadic incursions against settlements in North Syria"⁴⁶.

³⁷ On the identity of the sender of the letter and its recipient see A. Hagenbuchner, *Die Korrespondenz der Hethiter*, vol. 2, Heidelberg 1989, p. 268; *id.*, *ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 158 n. 8 and 161-162. Also, H. Klengel, *Syria 3000 to 300 B.C.*, Berlin 1992, p. 125 and n. 199; *id.*, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, pp. 222, 245; W. Mayer, *Politik und Kriegskunst der Assyrier*, Münster 1995, p. 201.

³⁸ G. M. Beckman, *Hittite Administration in Syria*, p. 44, on the texts Emar VI 42 and HCCT 7, he also believes that the "Hurrians" of both documents refer to Ḫanigalbat.

³⁹ A. Tsukimoto, ASJ 13 p. 192.

⁴⁰ M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, p. 35.

⁴¹ M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, p. 34.

⁴² M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, p. 33.

⁴³ M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, p. 37.

⁴⁴ M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, pp. 48-49.

⁴⁵ During the probable attempt of a coup d'état of Kuruntaš, king of Tarḫuntašša, against Arnuwandaš III, cf. M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, p. 51ff.

⁴⁶ M. R. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements*, p. 104.

To summarize: the second half of the 13th century B.C. is the most reasonable period for the second-last king of Emar, Pilsu-Dagan, and therefore, the Hurrian attack against Emar. In this context it is convenient to recall the letter RS 34.165, discovered in Ugarit and published by S. Lackenbacher⁴⁷. A king, no doubt Assyrian, informs another, most probably the king of Ugarit, about the diplomatic and military events that led to an armed confrontation with Ḫatti in Niḫriya⁴⁸ towards 1234/3 B.C.⁴⁹, with the result (according to the Assyrian king) of an Assyrian victory. The king of Ḫatti is Tuthaliya IV (obv. 21); most probably, the recipient of the letter is Ibiranu⁵⁰, king of Ugarit (ca. 1235-1225/1220)⁵¹. Some authors have suggested identifying the Assyrian king with Salmaneser I⁵², but the arguments favouring Tukulti-Ninurta I⁵³ seem more solid. The latter's reign and his assault on Ḫatti may well be the context that best explains the possibility of attacks by non-Assyrians against Hittite territory. Thus, the attack by Hurrians against Emar may be dated towards the end of the thirties of the 13th century B.C., which would result in synchronism of Pilsu-Dagan - Tukulti-Ninurta I – Tuthaliya IV – Ibiranu.

3.4. In addition to these attacks by Hurrians, two other texts attest to further attacks that Emar underwent, at some point in its history, by other groups or peoples. These documents are as follows:

- TBR 25:2-3 (sale of self into serfdom): *i-na* MU ERIM^{mes} TAR-PI / URU.KI *la-mi*
- TBR 44:2-3 (sale of self into serfdom): *i-na* MU KALAG.GA *ša* ERIM^{mes} TAR-PI /

^{uru} *e-mar il-mi-ma*

These two passages have repeatedly been debated, without agreement on the exact

⁴⁷ S. Lackenbacher, *Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit. I.- Une lettre royale*, RA 76 (1982) pp. 141-156; *id.*, *Lettre du roi (d'Assyrie?) au roi (d'Ougarit?)*, in P. Bordreuil (ed.), *Une bibliothèque au sud of la ville*, RSO VII, Paris 1991, pp. 90-100.

⁴⁸ On the location of Niḫriya, I. Singer, *The Battle of Niḫriya and the End of the Hittite Empire*, ZA 75 (1985), p. 106 proposes "a location north or northeast of Diyarbakir"; cf. also p. 108. J. A. Belmonte, *RGTC 12.2* (in press), s.v. Niḫriya: "Stadt in der Gegend von Diyarbakir und Urfa" (personal communication, November 2000). See also S. Lackenbacher's considerations, *Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit*, p. 151-152; *id.*, RSO VII pp. 96-97.

⁴⁹ On the date setting of the battle see S. Lackenbacher, *Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit*, p. 155; *id.*, RSO VII p. 99; I. Singer, *The Battle of Niḫriya*, p. 108 n. 50.

⁵⁰ Cf. S. Lackenbacher, *Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit*, p. 149; *id.*, RSO VII p. 95; I. Singer, *The Battle of Niḫriya*, p. 100.

⁵¹ On the reign and chronology of Ibiranu see I. Singer, *A Political History of Ugarit*, in W. G. E. Watson - N. Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden 1999, pp. 683-691.

⁵² See bibliography in I. Singer, *A Political History of Ugarit*, p. 689 n. 288. Add M. Liverani, *Guerra e diplomazia nell' Antico Oriente. 1600-1100 a.C.*, Rome-Bari 1994, pp. 149-151.

⁵³ On the arguments in favour of considering Tukulti-Ninurta I as the author of the letter, S. Lackenbacher, *Nouveaux documents d'Ugarit*, p. 155-156; *id.*, RSO VII p. 100, and the study of I. Singer, *The Battle of Niḫriya*, pp. 100-123.

reading of the term TAR-PI, its meaning, and its identification with a specific group or people. The main proposals may be summarized as follows:

- Arnaud, the editor of the two texts, reads *ṭár-wu*⁵⁴, a term he translates by "hordes": "Pendant l'année ou les hordes assiégeaient la ville" (TBR 25), "l'année terrible où les hordes assiégeaient la ville d'Emar" (TBR 44). He interprets *ṭarwu* as a term of the root *ṭrw "'venir de loin, sans être attendu, à l'insu de, d'après l'arabe"⁵⁵;

- Astour⁵⁶ believes that "these mentions refer to the same enemies who are elsewhere called 'Hurrian troops', but I cannot propose with certainty an explanation of the appellation". However, he makes the two following proposals: a) "It could have been a Hurrian word, unfortunately of unknown meaning, which is found in a couple of north Assyrian toponyms (Naštarwe, Intarwe)"; or b) reading *ṭar-pi*, and understanding the term from the root *ṭrp "(Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic) 'to take by force, afflict, torment, rend to pieces (as beasts of prey)'"

- Zaccagnini⁵⁷ thinks that "it is difficult to suggest any philological explanation that might account for the plausible and expected correspondence of the ERIM^{mes} TAR-PI and the (ERIM^{mes}) *Hur-ri*". He then includes a suggestion by G. Wilhelm, according to which "one could tentatively hypothesize that TAR-PI represents a somewhat unusual - and as yet unknown- graphic rendering of the Hurrian word *tor(u)bi* 'enemy'"

- Adamthwaite discusses various possibilities and concludes that "the explanation [of *ṭarwu*] as an ethnic proper name is probably the best on available information"⁵⁸.

In any case, there is at the moment no evidence that allows the TAR-PI-troops to be identified with the Hurrians who attack Emar, and there is no sign at all that the attacks by both troops were carried out during the same period. On the contrary, some texts contain data suggesting that Emar probably underwent attacks and an economic crisis in different periods, specially those texts that refer to the price of grain, which may vary between 1 and 3 *qa* per shekel of silver, depending on the documents⁵⁹.

3.5. It is still difficult to establish direct relationships between the texts that explicitly

⁵⁴ No doubt a printing mistake for *ṭar-wu*; cf. TBR p. 11.

⁵⁵ D. Arnaud, TBR p. 11.

⁵⁶ M. Astour, *Who Was the King of the Hurrian Troops*, p. 32 n. 28.

⁵⁷ C. Zaccagnini, *War and Famine*, p. 96 n. 15.

⁵⁸ M. R. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements*, p. 105; cf. also p. 111.

⁵⁹ D. Arnaud, TBR p. 15, with n. 1; C. Zaccagnini, *War and Famine*, p. 100. Also in the sense of attacks during different epochs, but based on other arguments, see also M. R. Adamthwaite, *Ethnic Movements*, pp. 105-106, 111. For A. Skaist, *The Chronology*, p. 67, the assault by the TAR-PI-troops is the same one as the one by the Hurrian troops during the reign of Pilsu-Dagan, an event which the author dates between 1268-1265 B.C., cf. above §3.3.4.

mention attacks against Emar (§3.3, 3.4) and those that generally refer to periods of hostility and difficult living conditions (§3.2). But some prosopographic data, noted by some authors, now enable some links to be established between both groups of texts. Thus, Beckman⁶⁰ points out that Ba'al-gamil (^dİŠKUR-*ga-mil*), author and scribe of the legal text RE 77, where the Hurrian king's attack against Emar is mentioned (§3.3.3), is also the scribe of the texts Iraq 54, 2 (§3.2) and Emar VI 111, where "years of hostility and hardship" (MU^{hà} *nu-kur-ti* KALAG.GA) are alluded to. Independently, Skaist⁶¹ pointed out the possibility that the year of the attack of the TAR-PI-troops of TBR 44 may be the same as the "year of hardship" (MU KALAG.GA) of AuOr 5, 12:3⁶². The key would be the mention in TBR 44:14-15 and AuOr 5, 12:4 of Ibni-^dKUR "son of the fortune-teller" (DUMU ḪAL), most certainly the same person in both texts. Future prosopographic studies will no doubt strengthen the relationships between both types of texts, as well as clarifying the chronological problems that still remains.

3.6. The texts that document attacks against Emar (§3.3, 3.4) show that this modest kingdom had to participate in wars and battles during several periods of its history, even though they were defensive in nature. In order to face the external attacks successfully, Emar no doubt counted on the presence of Hittite military contingents, but also on its own army, as shown by several documents, as will be seen below⁶³.

4. Data regarding the army of Emar

4.1. In several texts from Emar and its vicinity, the term ^{giš}TUKUL "weapon" may be found related to the verbs *našû* "to sustain, carry" and *leqû* "to take"⁶⁴. Beckman compiled a list of references⁶⁵, which may now be completed with the addition of the text RE 78⁶⁶. The texts, nine in all, are: AuOr 5, 13:12 (testament), Emar VI 18:19

⁶⁰ G. Beckman, RE p. 98.

⁶¹ A. Skaist, The Chronology, p. 51 n. 28.

⁶² D. Arnaud, AuOr 5 p. 231.

⁶³ In this context, the assumption by C. Zaccagnini, War and Famine, p. 100, that some of the women who the legal texts of Emar present serious economic problems were war widows, turns out to be more than plausible.

⁶⁴ Emar VI 112:16: *li-il-qè-e-ma*. In Emar VI 33:26, D. Arnaud reads and translates ^{giš}TUKUL *ša* LUGAL-*ri ta-kil* "tu tiendras l'arme du roi". He considers *ta-kil* as a form of *kullu* "to sustain". However, the form is somewhat problematic, as has been pointed out by R. H. Beal, The ^{giš}TUKUL-Institution in Second Millennium Ḫatti, *AoF* 15 (1988), p. 290 n. 115.

⁶⁵ G. Beckman, Real Property at Emar, in G. D. Young - M. W. Chavalas - R. E. Averbek (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries and Linking Horizons. Studies in Honor of Michael C. Astour*, Bethesda 1997, p. 107 n. 87.

⁶⁶ The end of line 15 of RE 30 still remains obscure. Beckman suggests reading and translating: É-*tu*₄ TUR.MEŠ TUKUL[?] "the smaller houses subject to corvée duty[?]"; cf. his comment *ibid.* p. 51. See also A.

(decree of Ini-Tešup, king of Karkemiš), Emar VI 33:26 (legal case), Emar VI 112:16 (testament), Emar VI 276:6.8.14 (list of persons), HCCT 46:11.21 (decree by a Hittite prince), HCCT 47:4 (gift of a house by a Hittite prince), Iraq 54, 1:8 (adoption contract) and RE 78:*passim* ("list of Persons and Service Duties").

At first, the expression to “carry the weapon” seemed to point to the existence of an obligation of a military nature in Emar⁶⁷. However, the progressive edition of new texts has allowed a more precise interpretation to be made. On the one hand, as proved by M. Yamada⁶⁸, the mentions of the ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation in texts of Emar belong more to the Hittite social world than to the society of Emar. Some of the Emar documents refer to the ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation with regard to the king of Karkemiš (Emar VI 33; HCCT 46; HCCT 47) or to a brother of his (Emar VI 18)⁶⁹, no doubt indicating the existence of a close relationship with the ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation existing in Ḫatti⁷⁰. On the other hand, the ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation seems to have had a military origin in Ḫatti, a system by means of which certain types of soldiers (LÚ^{meš} ^{gis}TUKUL) were given a plot of land as payment. But with the passing of time, this system started losing its military nature, and ultimately referred to people who carried out tasks and functions that were not strictly military, even though the nature of the ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation is not clear⁷¹. Such a situation seems also to be present in Emar, as shown by RE 78, a list of persons divided into ten groups, in which ^{gis}TUKUL refers to a door-keeper (l. 4) and a singer (l. 11). As Beckman points out, "since the ten groupings of personal names are summarized in line 27 as 10 ^{gis}TUKUL, the Sumerogram must have the extended meaning 'work squad'"⁷².

Tsukimoto, *WO* 29 (1998) p. 187 ("mešqú etwa 'Wasserstelle'? É-tu4 DUMU^{!meš} -šú?").

⁶⁷ See, for example, A. Tsukimoto, Eine neue Urkunde des Tili-Šarruma, Sohn des Königs von Karkamiš, *AcSum* 6 (1984), pp. 67-68: "Kriegsdienst"; although he also points out other possibilities, "so etwa wie Statussymbol"; J.-M. Durand, Minima hurritica, *NABU* 1989, p. 37 sub b); *id.*, *RA* 83 (1989) pp. 175 n. 43, 177.

⁶⁸ M. Yamada, The Hittite Social Concept of 'Free' in the Light of the Emar Texts, *AoF* 22 (1995), pp. 297-316.

⁶⁹ On texts VI 18, HCCT 46 and HCCT 47, see also R. H. Beal's comment, The ^{gis}TUKUL-Institution, pp. 289-290.

⁷⁰ In this sense, see G. Beckman, Real Property at Emar, p. 107 n. 87. The ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation has been studied by R. H. Beal, The ^{gis}TUKUL-Institution, pp. 269-305.

⁷¹ On this matter, see R. H. Beal, The ^{gis}TUKUL-Institution, pp. 291-292 y 304; *id.*, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, Heidelberg 1992, pp. 55-56; F. Imparati, Die Organisation des hethitischen Staates, in H. Klengel, *Geschichte des hethitischen Reiches*, p. 350, with n. 112. But see the arguments by M. Yamada, The Hittite Social Concept of 'Free', p. 303 n. 27, in favour of considering the ^{gis}TUKUL-obligation as an obligation of the military type.

⁷² RE p. 100. Other texts, of a legal nature (AuOr 5, 13; Iraq 54, 1), mention the inheritance of ^{gis}TUKUL from father to son. Pertinent is the following comment by D. Arnaud, *SMEA* 30 p. 203, with reference to HCCT 47: "qui 'brandit l'arme' of tel ou tel groupe...montre son appartenance à ce groupe...meme si une connotation militaire n'est pas exclue...le sens premier renvoie aux structures tribales ou claniques des

4.2. Emar VI 42, discussed above (§3.3), mentions the term *hurādu*: *hu-ra-du / ša ŠÀ-šu u BĀD-šu* "the *hurādu* -soldiers of the interior (of the city) and of the walls" (ll. 14-15)⁷³. For now, it is the only mention of this type of soldiers in the texts of Emar. In Ugarit, the term *hrd* seems to designate the part of the army composed by levies and recruitment. The contribution of this type of troops of a temporary nature to the army was obtained from different districts of the kingdom and the administrative control of the procedure was performed per district. A similar situation, that is, of armies formed by recruited and permanent troops, can be found in armies of other states contemporary with Ugarit⁷⁴. A similar organization for Emar's army may be assumed, but Emar VI 42 only shows that the *hurādu*-troops held a prominent role in surveillance and defence tasks, both within the city as well as on the walls. On the other hand, the existence of walls in the new city of Emar has been proved archeologically, though not the exact location of the gates⁷⁵. Several texts, however, mention gates of the city which, as shown by RE 73, were guarded by units of three to five soldiers called "guards" (*ma-ša-ra-tu₄*), each one under the orders of an UGULA- official, as is assumed from TBR 98⁷⁶.

4.3. Emar VI 17 deals with a failed conspiracy against Zū-Aštarti, king of Emar. Although the readings and interpretations are uncertain,⁷⁷ it provides information about the army of Emar⁷⁸. Line 3 mentions the *hupšu*- category (ERIM^{mes uru} *E-mar^{ki} hu-up-šu*), which is well known as a social group in other Syrian archives such as Mari⁷⁹ or Alalakh. Within the context of the document, *hupšu* in Emar seems to designate a class of soldier, perhaps some type of citizen who offered a military service of a temporary nature⁸⁰. Ugarit seems to have a similar situation, where the category of *hupšu* with a

Syriens de la moyenne vallée of l'Euphrate".

⁷³ Following D. Arnaud's reading, *Emar VI*, p. 57. Line 15, however, has some problems in reading and interpretation, see above n. 27.

⁷⁴ J.-P. Vita, *El ejército of Ugarit*, Madrid 1995, pp. 143-144; *id.*, The Society of Ugarit, in W. G. E. Watson - N. Wyatt (eds.), *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, Leiden 1999 p. 493.

⁷⁵ J.-C. Margueron, Meskene (Imar/Emar), p. 90. Also, J.-C. Margueron - M. Sigrist, Emar, in E. Meyers (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, vol. 2, Oxford 1997, p. 237; M. R. Adamthwaite, Ethnic Movements, p. 102 (with a personal communication from Margueron).

⁷⁶ The relationship between texts RE 73 and TBR 98 has been established by G. Beckman, RE p. 94.

⁷⁷ On the latter, see specially J.-M. Durand, *RA* 83 (1989) pp. 175-176; F. M. Fales, Notes on the Royal Family, pp. 84-86.

⁷⁸ S. Dalley - B. Teissier, *Iraq* 54 p. 96, points out that the seal of text Num. 3 which they publish *ibid.* is the same as that of Emar VI 17.

⁷⁹ J.-M. Durand, *RA* 83 (1989) p. 175 n. 40: "le sens fondamental semble être celui of 'paysan'".

⁸⁰ For now a translation of a somewhat neutral nature, like the one proposed by F. M. Fales, Notes on the Royal Family, p. 85: "*hupšu*-troops", may, at the moment, be the most appropriate. D. Arnaud, *Emar VI.1* p. 27: "supplétifs"; J.-M. Durand, *RA* 83 (1989) p. 175: "secondes classes", cf. n. 40. A different

military nature is also attested⁸¹. Later on, lines 4 and 5 of Emar VI 17 mention the "brothers of the king who bear the bronze spear before the king" (LÚ^{mes} aḥ-ḥi-a ša LUGAL-ri ša ZAG ZABAR a-na muḥ-ḥi LU<GAL>-ri na-šu). According to Durand, the expression ZAG ZABAR *našû* designates the duty of the military service and he translates the two lines as "des officiers supérieurs qui faisaient le service militaire pour le roi"⁸². Nevertheless, the "brothers of the king who bear the bronze spear before the king" could really be a type of royal guard in Emar; note that in Ḫatti the palace guards were composed of different types of soldiers armed with spears and had names such as "Golden-Spear Men", "Bronze-Spear Men", etc.⁸³

4.4. The Emar texts mention other types of soldiers and officials. For example archers, as shown in the long "Tablet of men who have taken up their bows in the temple of Ba'al" (Emar VI 52:1: *ṭup-pí LÚ^{mes} ša gišPAN a-na É dIŠKUR il-[qu]*). A large number of the lines in the text are preceded by a mark that, according to Arnaud, indicates that the person mentioned after it has, in fact, received the bow⁸⁴. On the other hand, two of the inventories of the temple of M₁ mention, among other objects, bows and arrows. The former, Emar VI 285, lists the belongings of a fortune-teller, among which there are 21 and 250 arrow heads (ll. 7-8). The latter, Emar VI 290, mentions 4 bows and 50 arrow heads (ll. 5-8). Both texts could suggest an average of about 12 arrows per bow, similar to the average attested in Ugarit, where about 10 arrows seem to correspond to each bow⁸⁵. On the other hand, two other inventories mention 2 bows and 10 arrows (ET 21:10), as well as 2 bows and 15 arrows (ET 29:11-12), respectively. The average was higher in other sites, such as in Nuzi, where the average seems to have been between 25 and 40 arrows per archer⁸⁶; elsewhere, instead, the number was lower⁸⁷.

interpretation of the passage may be found in G. Bunnens, *Emar on the Euphrates in the 13th Century B.C., Abr-Nahrain* 27 (1989), pp. 28-29. Another possible mention of *ḥupšu*-soldiers, written *ḥúp-še^{mes}*, is provided by a text from Emar or its surroundings, published by M. Fales, in F. M. Fales *et al.*, *Prima dell'alfabeto. La storia della scrittura attraverso testi cuneiformi inediti. Studi e documenti*, vol. IV, Venice 1989, pp. 207-208.

⁸¹ P. Bordreuil - D. Pardee, in P. Bordreuil (ed.), *RSO VII*, p. 144: "*ḥuptu*-soldat"; G. del Olmo - J. Sanmartín, *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*, vol. I, Barcelona 1996, p. 196: "2) type of 'legionary' or 'mercenary'"; J.-P. Vita, *El ejército de Ugarit*, p. 136.

⁸² J.-M. Durand, *RA* 83 (1989) p. 175.

⁸³ R. H. Beal, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, pp. 212-231.

⁸⁴ D. Arnaud, *Emar VI.1* p. 67.

⁸⁵ J.-P. Vita, *El ejército de Ugarit*, p. 151.

⁸⁶ T. Kendall, *Warfare and Military Matters in the Nuzi Tablets*, Brandeis University, Ph.D., 1975, p. 212. In the letter of Kāmid el-Lōz KL 72:600, in the El-Amarna period, "1 quiver together with 30 bronze

4.5. Other documents offer information with regard to the war chariot. The first witness of the legal text TBR 77 is a *kartappu* (l. 17), a term meaning “charioteer” as seems clear both in Ḫatti⁸⁸ as well as in the El-Amarna letters⁸⁹. Other documents mention the chief person in charge of the chariots, the “Great one of the chariots”⁹⁰: in one case, as the first witness of a contract (Emar VI 117:22: *lúGAL gišGIGIRmeš*)⁹¹, in another, as the person who seals a legal text (TBR 34:16: *GAL LÚmeš gišGIGIR*). In all these cases, they are simply the titles of the witnesses of legal documents, mentions that do not offer further information about the functions or attributions of these military ranks⁹².

4.6. Other possible mentions of officials are uncertain⁹³. For example the term *tartannu*, which Arnaud translated as “general”; this would then refer to a distant ancestor of the Assyrian official with the same title from the I millennium B.C.⁹⁴ In the legal text Emar VI 221, a witness is listed as the “son of the *tartannu*” (l. 12: *DUMU tar-ta-ni*), while in another, a “son of the *tartannu*” seals the document Emar VI 118 (l. 12). Another *tartannu* (*lútar-ta-ni*) seals the document Emar VI 128 (l. 27). Furthermore, the legal text RE 10 mentions a “son of the *tartannu*”, who is a recipient of money (l. 13) and a witness (l. 38). It also mentions a *tartannu* who seals the document (l. 34). It may be noted that none of these documents allows us to gain some

arrows” (ll. 14-15) is mentioned, see G. Wilhelm, *Ein Brief der Amarna-Zeit aus Kāmid el-Lōz*, ZA (63) (1973) p. 71.

⁸⁷ Cf. the texts of Alalāḫ AT *203-206.

⁸⁸ Cf. F. Pecchioli Daddi, *Il lúkartappu nel regno Ittita*, *Studi Classici e Orientali* 26 (1977) pp. 169-191, especially p. 189; R. H. Beal, *The Organisation of the Hittite Military*, pp. 155-162. G. M. Beckman, *Hittite Provincial Administration*, p. 30 translates *kartappu* in TBR 77:17 as “charioteer”.

⁸⁹ J.-P. Vita, *El ejército de Ugarit*, p. 124.

⁹⁰ D. Arnaud *Emar VI*, p. 124: “grand des chars”; *id.*, TBR p. 68: “grand des charriers”; G. M. Beckman, *Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: the View from Masat and Emar*, in O. Carruba - M. Giorgieri - C. Mora (eds.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 1995, p. 30: “head of the chariotry”.

⁹¹ On this mention see also M. Yamada, *The Hittite Social Concept of 'Free' in the Light of the Emar Texts*, *AoF* 22 (1995), p. 304 n. 33.

⁹² The legal text RE 66 is the only one from Emar that mentions the category of *maryannu*. According to this document, it is a category without any military connotations. On this text see also M. Heltzer, *Or* 67 (1998) p. 141. As for the category of *maryannu* in the Syria of the Final Bronze Age, see J.-P. Vita, *El ejército de Ugarit*, Madrid 1995, pp. 93-105.

⁹³ With regard to the translation of Arnaud of *be-li ki-iḫ-ri* as “chef du détachement” in Emar VI 17:8.18, cf. F. M. Fales, *Notes on the Royal Family of Emar*, in D. Charpin - F. Joannès (eds.), *Marchands, diplomates et empereurs*, Paris 1991, p. 85 n. 26.

idea of the nature of the rank or title of *tartannu*, which is why, as pointed out by Beckman, the exact meaning of the term in Emar must be left open ⁹⁵.

⁹⁴ On which see, for example, F. Malbran-Labat, *L'armée et l'organisation militaire de l'Assyrie*, Genève-Paris 1982, p. 146; W. Mayer, *Politik und Kriegskunst der Assyrier*, p. 434 ("Grosswesir"); *AHW* p. 1332, *ta/urtānu* 3) "Feldmarschall?".

⁹⁵ G. M. Beckman, Hittite Provincial Administration in Anatolia and Syria: The View from Masat and Emar, in O. Carruba - M. Giorgieri - C. Mora (eds.), *Atti del II Congresso Internazionale di Hittitologia*, Pavia 1995, p. 29; *id.*, *RE* p. 19.